

BOUNDS FOR THE RAYLEIGH QUOTIENT AND THE SPECTRUM OF SELF-ADJOINT OPERATORS *

PEIZHEN ZHU^{†‡} MERICO E. ARGENTATI^{†‡} AND ANDREW V. KNYAZEVA^{†‡§¶}

Abstract. The absolute change in the Rayleigh quotient (RQ) is bounded in this paper in terms of the norm of the residual and the change in the vector. If x is an eigenvector of a self-adjoint bounded operator A in a Hilbert space, then the RQ of the vector x , denoted by $\rho(x)$, is an exact eigenvalue of A . In this case, the absolute change of the RQ $|\rho(x) - \rho(y)|$ becomes the absolute error in an eigenvalue $\rho(x)$ of A approximated by the RQ $\rho(y)$ on a given vector y . There are three traditional kinds of bounds of the eigenvalue error: a priori bounds via the angle between vectors x and y ; a posteriori bounds via the norm of the residual $Ay - \rho(y)y$ of vector y ; mixed type bounds using both the angle and the norm of the residual. We propose a unifying approach to prove known bounds of the spectrum, analyze their sharpness, and derive new sharper bounds. The proof approach is based on novel RQ vector perturbation identities.

Key words. angles, perturbation, error analysis, Rayleigh quotient, eigenvalue.

AMS subject classification. 15A42, 15A60, 65F35.

1. Introduction. Let A be a bounded self-adjoint operator in a real or complex Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. For a nonzero vector x , the Rayleigh quotient (RQ) is defined by

$$\rho(x) = \rho(x, A) = \frac{\langle x, Ax \rangle}{\langle x, x \rangle}$$

and the corresponding residual vector is denoted by $r(x) = r(x, A) = Ax - \rho(x)x$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is an inner product, associated with a norm by $\|\cdot\|^2 = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. The acute angle between two nonzero vectors x and y is denoted by

$$\angle \{x, y\} = \arccos \frac{|\langle x, y \rangle|}{\|x\| \|y\|}.$$

We are interested in RQ vector perturbation bounds. Specifically, for nonzero vectors x and y , we want to bound the following quantity, $|\rho(y) - \rho(x)|$, in terms of $\angle \{x, y\}$, $\|r(x)\|$, and $\|r(y)\|$. If x is an eigenvector of A , then the RQ of x is an exact eigenvalue of A and $r(x) = 0$. In this case, the absolute change of the RQ $|\rho(y) - \rho(x)|$ becomes the absolute error in the eigenvalue $\rho(x)$ of A . The RQ is often used to approximate points of the spectrum $\Sigma(A)$ of A .

Known bounds of the spectrum are traditionally classified depending on the terms that appear in the bounds. Let $\lambda \in \Sigma(A)$ be approximated by $\rho(y)$, i.e., the absolute approximation error is $|\rho(y) - \lambda|$. Bounds of $|\rho(y) - \lambda|$ that are based on the norm of the residual $\|r(y)\|$ are called “a posteriori” bounds, since the residual $r(y)$ and its norm can typically be computed for the given vector y .

If λ is an eigenvalue with the corresponding eigenvector x , bounds of $|\rho(y) - \lambda|$ that rely on the angle $\angle \{x, y\}$ are called “a priori,” since the eigenvector x is usually

*A preliminary version is at <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/>. This material is based upon work partially supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant 1115734.

[†]Department of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences; University of Colorado Denver, P.O. Box 173364, Campus Box 170, Denver, CO 80217-3364, USA.

[‡](peizhen.zhu,merico.argentati,andrew.knyazev)[at]ucdenver.edu

[§]Mitsubishi Electric Research Laboratories; 201 Broadway Cambridge, MA 02139

[¶]<http://math.ucdenver.edu/~aknyazev/>

not explicitly known, and some a priori information about it needs to be used to bound the angle $\angle \{x, y\}$. In the context of the Finite Element Method error bounds, where x and y are functions, such information is usually associated with the smoothness of the function x ; see, e.g., [7]. Finally, we call a bound “a mixed type,” if it involves both terms, the residual norm $\|r(y)\|$ and the angle $\angle \{x, y\}$.

Sharp bounds of the spectrum approximation error are very important in the theory of numerical solution of self-adjoint eigenvalue problems. Computable a posteriori bounds allow one to obtain two-sided approximations to points of the spectrum. A priori and mixed bounds give one an opportunity to determine the quality of approximation of a point of the spectrum by the RQ.

We revisit this classical topic of research for two reasons. Our first goal is to carefully examine a posteriori and a priori bounds together, to understand what they have in common and why they are so different. Second, we are interested in discovering a general framework for deriving bounds of $|\rho(y) - \rho(x)|$ for arbitrary vectors x and y where known bounds of the spectrum approximation error become corollaries.

We start, in section 2, by reviewing three known bounds of the spectrum approximation error, each representing a priori, a posteriori, and mixed types, correspondingly. In section 3, we derive new identities and bounds for the change in the RQ with respect to the change of the vectors, using an orthogonal projector on the subspace $\text{span}\{x, y\}$. The idea of such a “low-dimensional” analysis has been found fruitful before, e.g., in [3]. We observe that in the case $\dim(\mathcal{H}) = 2$ all three bounds, which we want to reinvent, turn into the same identity. In section 4, we derive the a priori and mixed type bounds from this identity, using a single inequality, different for each bound, only at the last step. This unifying proof technique allows us to easily specify the circumstances, where the bounds are sharp. We dedicate separate section 5 to a posteriori bounds. Our “low-dimensional” analysis not only allows us to find a novel proof of a well known a posteriori bound, but also gives us an opportunity to improve it, and obtain several new sharper results. Our bonus section 6 touches the topic of improving known $\sin(2\theta)$ and $\tan(\theta)$ error bounds for eigenvectors.

2. Short review of some known error bounds for eigenvalues. Let y be an approximation to an eigenvector x of the operator A , corresponding to the eigenvalue $\rho(x)$ of A . An a priori bound involves a constant and the square of the sine of the angle between the eigenvector x and the vector y , see, e.g., [5, 6, 9],

$$(2.1) \quad |\lambda - \rho(y)| \leq (\Sigma_{\max}(A) - \Sigma_{\min}(A)) \sin^2(\angle \{x, y\}),$$

where we denote $\lambda = \rho(x)$, and $\Sigma_{\max}(A)$ and $\Sigma_{\min}(A)$ denote the largest and the smallest points of the spectrum $\Sigma(A)$ of A , correspondingly.

The mixed type bound shown in [4, 11] is in terms of the norm of the residual vector and the tangent of the angle between vectors x and y , i.e.,

$$(2.2) \quad |\lambda - \rho(y)| \leq \frac{\|r(y)\|}{\|y\|} \tan(\angle \{x, y\}).$$

There is no constraint on the location of the eigenvalue $\rho(x)$ relative to $\rho(y)$ in (2.1) and (2.2). Bounds (2.1) and (2.2) hold for any nonzero vector y and any eigenvector x . The next bound we review requires having some information about the spectrum of A in the neighborhood of $\rho(y)$. This a posteriori bound involves the square of the norm of the residual vector and the gap between $\rho(y)$ and the rest of the spectrum of A . Let us choose real numbers α and β such that $\alpha < \rho(y) < \beta$

and $\Sigma(A) \cap (\alpha, \beta) = \emptyset$, where $\Sigma(A)$ represents the spectrum of A . Then the Temple bound holds, see, e.g., [2, 13],

$$(2.3) \quad (\beta - \rho(y))(\rho(y) - \alpha) \leq \frac{\|r(y)\|^2}{\|y\|^2}.$$

The Temple bound (2.3) turns into an equality if both α and β are eigenvalues of A and the vector y is a linear combination of the corresponding eigenvectors.

Let now the only point of the spectrum $\Sigma(A)$ in the interval (a, b) be an eigenvalue λ and let also $\rho(y) \in (a, b)$, then

$$(2.4) \quad -\frac{1}{\rho(y) - a} \frac{\|r(y)\|^2}{\|y\|^2} \leq \rho(y) - \lambda \leq \frac{1}{b - \rho(y)} \frac{\|r(y)\|^2}{\|y\|^2}.$$

This is Kato-Temple's inequality [2, 13], and it easily follows from (2.3). Indeed, in the case where λ is located to the right of $\rho(y)$ then we take $\alpha = a$ and $\beta = \lambda$ in (2.3) to get the lower bound of (2.4). In the opposite case, we take $\alpha = \lambda$ and $\beta = b$ to obtain the upper bound of (2.4).

If we take $a = \rho(y) - \delta$ and $b = \rho(y) + \delta$ in (2.4), where $\delta = \min_{\eta \in \{\Sigma(A) \setminus \lambda\}} |\eta - \rho(y)|$, then (2.4) directly implies, see, e.g., [8, 10, 12],

$$(2.5) \quad |\lambda - \rho(y)| \leq \frac{1}{\delta} \frac{\|r(y)\|^2}{\|y\|^2}.$$

Bound (2.5) turns into an equality if $\lambda - \delta$ or $\lambda + \delta$ is an eigenvalue of A and the vector y is a linear combination of the corresponding to $\lambda - \delta$ or $\lambda + \delta$ eigenvector and an eigenvector corresponding to λ .

Since among all points of the spectrum of A , the isolated point $\lambda \in \Sigma(A)$ is the closest one to $\rho(y)$, we evidently have from (2.5) that

$$|\lambda - \rho(y)|^2 \leq |\lambda - \rho(y)|\delta \leq \frac{\|r(y)\|^2}{\|y\|^2},$$

which gives the Krylov-Weinstein bound, see, e.g., [8]

$$|\lambda - \rho(y)| \leq \frac{\|r(y)\|}{\|y\|}.$$

This derivation of the Krylov-Weinstein bound from bound (2.5), although trivial, is not apparently very well known. It demonstrates that the Krylov-Weinstein bound is simply a particular case of (2.5), where $|\lambda - \rho(y)| \leq \delta$.

Our discussion above shows that bound (2.3) is the most fundamental a posteriori bound, since other a posteriori bounds, reviewed here, can be derived from it. The main goal of the rest of the paper is to revisit bounds (2.1), (2.2), and (2.3). We propose a new unifying approach to prove them, analyze their sharpness, and derive some new sharper bounds.

3. Key identities for the RQ. We present several key identities for the absolute change in the RQ.

Let A be a bounded self-adjoint operator on a real or complex Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Let S denote a subspace of $\mathcal{H}$ and P_S be an orthogonal projector on S . Let $A_S = (P_S A)|_S$ denote the restriction of the operator $P_S A$ to the subspace S . For a nonzero vector

$x \in S$, we denote $\rho(x, A_S) = \langle x, A_S x \rangle / \langle x, x \rangle$ and $r(x, A_S) = A_S x - \rho(x, A_S)x \in S$. We start with a couple of trivial, but extremely important, for our approach, lemmas.

LEMMA 3.1. *If $x \in S$ then $\rho(x, A_S) = \rho(x)$.*

Proof. The orthogonal projector P_S is self-adjoint, so

$$\rho(x, A_S) = \frac{\langle x, P_S A_S x \rangle}{\langle x, x \rangle} = \frac{\langle x, A_S x \rangle}{\langle x, x \rangle} = \rho(x).$$

□

LEMMA 3.2. *If $x \in S$ then $r(x, A_S) = P_S r(x)$.*

Proof. Directly by the definition and Lemma 3.1, we obtain

$$r(x, A_S) = A_S x - \rho(x, A_S)x = P_S A_S x - \rho(x)x = P_S(A_S x - \rho(x)x) = P_S r(x).$$

□

In the rest of the paper, for given linearly independent vectors x and y in $\mathcal{H}$ we always define the subspace S as $S = \text{span}\{x, y\}$.

COROLLARY 3.3. *If one of the vectors x or y is an eigenvector of A , it is also an eigenvector of A_S .*

Proof. Let x be an eigenvector of A , then $r(x) = 0$, so $r(x, A_S) = P_S r(x) = 0$, which means that x is also an eigenvector of A_S . □

REMARK 3.4. *It is important to realize that the operator A_S acts in a two-dimensional space, thus many statements concerning A_S can be easily proved because of this. Here, we collect some basic identities, using the eigenvectors of A_S .*

Let us denote $\mu = \lambda_{\max}(A_S) = \rho(u_1)$ and $\nu = \lambda_{\min}(A_S) = \rho(u_2)$, where u_1 and u_2 are orthogonal eigenvectors of the operator A_S . Let P_i with $i = 1, 2$ denote the orthogonal projectors on the subspace $\text{span}(u_i)$. Assuming a nontrivial case $P_i x \neq 0$ for $i = 1, 2$, we evidently have $\angle\{x, u_i\} = \angle\{x, P_i x\}$. Now,

$$\rho(x) = \frac{\langle x, A_S x \rangle}{\langle x, x \rangle} = \frac{\langle P_1 x, A_S P_1 x \rangle + \langle P_2 x, A_S P_2 x \rangle}{\langle P_1 x, P_1 x \rangle + \langle P_2 x, P_2 x \rangle} = \frac{\mu \langle P_1 x, P_1 x \rangle + \nu \langle P_2 x, P_2 x \rangle}{\langle P_1 x, P_1 x \rangle + \langle P_2 x, P_2 x \rangle}$$

since $x = P_1 x + P_2 x$ and $P_1 P_2 = P_1 A_S P_2 = 0$. Therefore,

$$(3.1) \quad \mu - \rho(x) = (\mu - \nu) \sin^2(\angle\{x, u_1\}) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(x) - \nu = (\mu - \nu) \sin^2(\angle\{x, u_2\}).$$

Evidently, in a two-dimensional space,

$$(3.2) \quad \cos(\angle\{x, u_1\}) = \sin(\angle\{x, u_2\}) \quad \text{and} \quad \cos(\angle\{x, u_2\}) = \sin(\angle\{x, u_1\}).$$

3.1. Identities for the norm of the residual $r(x) = A_S x - \rho(x)x$. Our main identity is in the following lemma.

LEMMA 3.5.

$$(3.3) \quad [\lambda_{\max}(A_S) - \rho(x)] [\rho(x) - \lambda_{\min}(A_S)] = \frac{\|P_S r(x)\|^2}{\|x\|^2}.$$

Proof. Let us denote $\mu = \lambda_{\max}(A_S)$ and $\nu = \lambda_{\min}(A_S)$. By Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2, identity (3.3) can be equivalently rewritten as

$$[\mu - \rho(x, A_S)] [\rho(x, A_S) - \nu] = \frac{\|r(x, A_S)\|^2}{\|x\|^2}.$$

Since $\langle r(x, A_S), x \rangle = 0$, we have $\|r(x, A_S)\|^2 = \|A_S x\|^2 - \rho^2(x, A_S)\|x\|^2$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|r(x, A_S)\|^2}{\|x\|^2} - (\mu - \rho(x, A_S))(\rho(x, A_S) - \nu) &= \frac{\|A_S x\|^2}{\|x\|^2} - (\mu + \nu)\rho(x, A_S) + \mu\nu \\ &= \frac{\langle A_S x - \mu x, A_S x - \nu x \rangle}{\|x\|^2} \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $(A_S - \mu)(A_S - \nu) = 0$ is the minimal polynomial of A_S , since $\dim S = 2$ and μ and ν are the eigenvalues of A_S . $\square$

REMARK 3.6. *Let x be an eigenvector of A in Lemma 3.5. Then one of the two eigenvalues of A_S is equal to $\rho(x)$.*

Proof. The statement follows directly from Lemma 3.1 and Corollary 3.3. $\square$

We also mention the following identity, relying on eigenvectors of A_S .

LEMMA 3.7. *Let u_i with $i = 1, 2$ denote the eigenvectors of A_S . For both $i = 1$ and 2, we have*

$$(3.4) \quad \frac{1}{2} [\lambda_{\max}(A_S) - \lambda_{\min}(A_S)] \sin(2\angle\{x, u_i\}) = \frac{\|P_{Sr}(x)\|}{\|x\|}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, and using the notation of Remark 3.4, identity (3.4) can be equivalently rewritten as

$$\frac{1}{2} [\mu - \nu] \sin(2\angle\{x, u_i\}) = \frac{\|r(x, A_S)\|}{\|x\|}.$$

The statement of the lemma follows from Lemma 3.5 and the trigonometry identity for the sine of the double angle. $\square$

3.2. Identities for the absolute change in the RQ. Here we prove our main tangent- and sine-based identities.

REMARK 3.8. *Let $\angle\{x, y\} < \pi/2$. We note the following useful identities*

$$\frac{\|r(x)\|}{\|x\|} \frac{\cos(\angle\{r(x), y\})}{\cos(\angle\{x, y\})} = \frac{|\langle r(x), y \rangle|}{|\langle x, y \rangle|} = \frac{|\langle P_{Sr}(x), y \rangle|}{|\langle x, y \rangle|} = \frac{\|P_{Sr}(x)\|}{\|x\|} \frac{\cos(\angle\{P_{Sr}(x), y\})}{\cos(\angle\{x, y\})}$$

and

$$\frac{\|P_{Sr}(x)\|}{\|x\|} \frac{\cos(\angle\{P_{Sr}(x), y\})}{\cos(\angle\{x, y\})} = \frac{\|P_{Sr}(x)\|}{\|x\|} \tan(\angle\{x, y\}),$$

where $\cos(\angle\{P_{Sr}(x), y\}) = \sin(\angle\{x, y\})$. Indeed, $0 = \langle r(x), x \rangle = \langle P_{Sr}(x), x \rangle$, i.e., vectors $P_{Sr}(x) \in S$ and $x \in S$ are orthogonal in S , and also $y \in S$, where $\dim S = 2$. Let us finally also give an alternative simple identity,

$$\frac{|\langle r(x), y \rangle|}{|\langle x, y \rangle|} = \frac{|\langle P_y r(x), y \rangle|}{|\langle x, y \rangle|} = \frac{\|P_y r(x)\|}{\|x\|} \frac{\cos(\angle\{P_y r(x), y\})}{\cos(\angle\{x, y\})} = \frac{\|P_y r(x)\|}{\|x\| \cos(\angle\{x, y\})},$$

where P_y is an orthogonal projector on the subspace $\text{span}\{y\}$ and $\angle\{P_y r(x), y\} = 0$.

THEOREM 3.9. *Let $\angle\{x, y\} < \pi/2$ and let us denote*

$$\Xi_{\pm} = \left| \frac{\|P_{Sr}(x)\|}{\|x\|} \pm \frac{\|P_{Sr}(y)\|}{\|y\|} \right| \tan(\angle\{x, y\}).$$

We always have

$$\Xi_- \leq |\rho(x) - \rho(y)| \leq \Xi_+.$$

Now, let us assume that $\langle x, r(y) \rangle / \langle x, y \rangle$ or $\langle r(x), y \rangle / \langle x, y \rangle$ is real. Then

$$|\rho(x) - \rho(y)| = \Xi_+$$

if $\langle x, r(y) \rangle / \langle r(x), y \rangle \leq 0$ or $\langle r(x), y \rangle / \langle x, r(y) \rangle \leq 0$, otherwise,

$$|\rho(x) - \rho(y)| = \Xi_-.$$

Proof. By elementary calculations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho(x) - \rho(y)) \langle x, y \rangle &= \langle \rho(x)x, y \rangle - \langle x, \rho(y)y \rangle + \langle x, Ay \rangle - \langle Ax, y \rangle \\ &= \langle x, r(y) \rangle - \langle r(x), y \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

thus

$$(3.5) \quad |\rho(x) - \rho(y)| = \frac{|\langle x, r(y) \rangle - \langle r(x), y \rangle|}{|\langle x, y \rangle|}.$$

In a complex space, the RQ remains real, since A is Hermitian, but the scalar products may not be real, so in general we have, by the triangle inequality, that

$$||\langle x, r(y) \rangle| - |\langle r(x), y \rangle|| \leq |\langle x, r(y) \rangle - \langle r(x), y \rangle| \leq |\langle x, r(y) \rangle| + |\langle r(x), y \rangle|.$$

Unless one of the ratios $\langle x, r(y) \rangle / \langle x, y \rangle$ or $\langle r(x), y \rangle / \langle x, y \rangle$ is real, the inequalities above are strict. Indeed, the difference of the ratios is equal to $\rho(x) - \rho(y)$, i.e., is always real. Thus, one of the ratios is real if and only if one of the scalar products $\langle x, r(y) \rangle$ and $\langle r(x), y \rangle$ is a real scalar times the other.

The assumption $\angle \{x, y\} < \pi/2$ implies that at least one of the scalar products $\langle x, r(y) \rangle$ and $\langle r(x), y \rangle$ is non-zero. Let it be, e.g., $\langle r(x), y \rangle$. If $\langle x, r(y) \rangle / \langle r(x), y \rangle \geq 0$ then the left inequality turns into an equality. If $\langle x, r(y) \rangle / \langle r(x), y \rangle \leq 0$ then the right inequality turns into an equality. All other cases, possible in a complex space, lead to strict inequalities above.

The statements of the theorem now follow directly from Remark 3.8. $\square$

LEMMA 3.10. For both $i = 1$ and 2 , we have

$$(3.6) \quad |\rho(x) - \rho(y)| = [\mu - \nu] \sin(\angle \{x, u_i\} + \angle \{y, u_i\}) |\sin(\angle \{x, u_i\} - \angle \{y, u_i\})|.$$

Proof. Identities (3.1) and (3.2) of Remark 3.4 imply

$$|\rho(x) - \rho(y)| = [\mu - \nu] |\cos^2(\angle \{x, u_i\}) - \cos^2(\angle \{y, u_i\})|,$$

which leads directly to identity (3.6) using elementary trigonometry. $\square$

THEOREM 3.11. Let us for $i = 1$ or 2 denote

$$\Psi_{\pm} = [\lambda_{\max}(A_S) - \lambda_{\min}(A_S)] |\sin(\angle \{x, u_i\} \pm \angle \{y, u_i\})| \sin(\angle \{x, y\}),$$

and let $C = \langle x, u_1 \rangle \langle u_2, x \rangle \langle u_1, y \rangle \langle y, u_2 \rangle$. We always have

$$\Psi_- \leq |\rho(x) - \rho(y)| \leq \Psi_+.$$

If C is a complex quantity then both inequalities on the left and right are strict. If $C \geq 0$ ($C \leq 0$) then we have equality for the lower (upper) bound.

Proof. Identity (3.6) makes the statement of the theorem equivalent to

$$(3.7) \quad |\sin(\angle\{x, u_i\} - \angle\{y, u_i\})| \leq \sin \angle\{x, y\} \leq \sin(\angle\{x, u_i\} + \angle\{y, u_i\}).$$

For simplicity of notation, let us assume, without loss of generality, that all vectors involved here are normalized, i.e., $\|u_1\| = \|u_2\| = \|x\| = \|y\| = 1$. Using representations of the vectors x and y with respect to the orthonormal basis u_1 and u_2 of the subspace S , we obtain by direct computation

$$\sin^2 \angle\{x, y\} = \cos^2 \angle\{x, u_1\} \cos^2 \angle\{y, u_2\} + \cos^2 \angle\{x, u_2\} \cos^2 \angle\{y, u_1\} - 2\Re(C)$$

and

$$|C| = \cos \angle\{x, u_1\} \cos \angle\{x, u_2\} \cos \angle\{y, u_1\} \cos \angle\{y, u_2\}$$

Evidently, $-|C| \leq \Re(C) \leq |C|$, and if $C \geq 0$ ($C \leq 0$) then $\Re(C) = |C|$ ($\Re(C) = -|C|$), which proves bounds (3.7) and also gives conditions of their sharpness. $\square$

REMARK 3.12. *An alternative proof of Theorem 3.11 is based on the fact that angles between subspaces describe a metric, see, e.g. [14] and references there, so*

$$(3.8) \quad |\angle\{x, u\} - \angle\{y, u\}| \leq \angle\{x, y\} \leq |\angle\{x, u\} + \angle\{y, u\}|.$$

Theorem 3.11 trivially implies the bound

$$|\rho(x) - \rho(y)| \leq [\lambda_{\max}(A_S) - \lambda_{\min}(A_S)] \sin(\angle\{x, y\})$$

that can be found for the real case in [6].

Finally, we apply our results above to an important special case.

COROLLARY 3.13. *Let x be an eigenvector of A and $\rho(x) = \lambda$. Then*

$$(3.9) \quad |\lambda - \rho(y)| = [\lambda_{\max}(A_S) - \lambda_{\min}(A_S)] \sin^2(\angle\{x, y\}).$$

If, in addition $\angle\{x, y\} < \pi/2$, then

$$(3.10) \quad |\lambda - \rho(y)| = \frac{\|P_{Sr}(y)\|}{\|y\|} \tan(\angle\{x, y\}).$$

If also $\eta \neq \lambda$ denotes an eigenvalue of A_S , then

$$(3.11) \quad \tan(\angle\{x, y\}) = \frac{1}{|\eta - \rho(y)|} \frac{\|P_{Sr}(y)\|}{\|y\|}.$$

Proof. Since x is an eigenvector of A it is also an eigenvector of A_S , with the same eigenvalue $\rho(x) = \lambda$, by Corollary 3.3. The statements (3.9) and (3.10) follow directly from Theorems 3.9 and 3.11, correspondingly. Finally, identity (3.11) comes from (3.3) and (3.10). $\square$

4. Deriving some known eigenvalue error bounds from our identities.

We now easily derive two known bounds, reviewed in section 2, from the results obtained in section 3. First, since $\Sigma_{\min}(A) \leq \lambda_{\min}(A_S) \leq \lambda_{\max}(A_S) \leq \Sigma_{\max}(A)$, from (3.9) we obtain a priori bound (2.1),

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda - \rho(y)| &= [\lambda_{\max}(A_S) - \lambda_{\min}(A_S)] \sin^2(\angle\{x, y\}) \\ &\leq [\Sigma_{\max}(A) - \Sigma_{\min}(A)] \sin^2(\angle\{x, y\}). \end{aligned}$$

The inequality becomes an equality if $\Sigma_{\max}(A)$ and $\Sigma_{\min}(A)$ are eigenvalues of A_S . For details, see reference [6].

The second known result, mixed bound (2.2), follows from (3.10),

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda - \rho(y)| &= \frac{\|P_S r(y)\|}{\|y\|} \tan(\angle\{x, y\}) \\ &\leq \frac{\|r(y)\|}{\|y\|} \tan(\angle\{x, y\}), \end{aligned}$$

The inequality turns into an equality iff $P_S r(y) = r(y)$, i.e., iff $Ay \in \text{span}\{x, y\}$, which is equivalent to the subspace $\text{span}\{x, y\}$ being A -invariant. More detailed information about the quality of this bound is determined by Remark 3.8 where vectors x and y are swapped to give us the following identity

$$\|r(y)\| \cos(\angle\{r(y), x\}) = \|P_S r(y)\| \cos(\angle\{P_S r(y), x\}).$$

REMARK 4.1. *Our assumption that the operator A is bounded is necessary in bound (2.1) and can be used in bound (2.2) to guarantee the existence of the vector Ay . Our results of section 3 formally speaking would hold for an unbounded operator A and given vectors x and y as soon as the operator A_S can be correctly defined by $A_S = (P_S A)|_S$, where $S = \text{span}\{x, y\}$. One could do even better than that, in fact, one only needs to be able to correctly define the values $\rho(x)$ and $\rho(y)$.*

Rather than getting into technical details, we illustrate such a possibility using the following example from Davis and Kahan [1]. Let $\epsilon = 1/2$ and $\mathcal{H} = l_2$. We take $y = (1, \epsilon, \epsilon^2, \dots, \epsilon^n, \dots) \in l_2$ and $A = \text{diag}(1, \epsilon^{-1}, \epsilon^{-2}, \dots, \epsilon^{-n}, \dots)$. We get $\rho(y) = 1 + \epsilon$ even though the vector $Ay = (1, 1, 1, \dots)$ has an infinite norm in l_2 . Let us take $x = (1, 0, 0, \dots)$, the eigenvector corresponding to the lowest eigenvalue $\rho(x) = 1$, and define $w = (0, \epsilon, \epsilon^2, \epsilon^3, \dots)$ with $\rho(w) = (1 + \epsilon)/\epsilon$. Then A_S can be constructed using its eigenvectors x and w and the corresponding eigenvalues $\rho(x)$ and $\rho(w)$ despite of the fact that $Aw = (0, 1, 1, \dots)$ does not exist in $\mathcal{H} = l_2$.

We have now demonstrated how two known bounds, a priori bound (2.1) and mixed bound (2.2), can be derived in a simple and uniform manner from essentially two dimensional identities (3.9) and (3.10). The last well known bounds, we review in section 2, the a posteriori Temple bound (2.3) and its follow-up (2.5), can also be derived in a similar way from their two dimensional prototype (3.3). However, the derivation is not so trivial, so we dedicate a separate section for it, coming next.

5. New a posteriori bounds for eigenvalues. For convenience, let us remind the reader of the Temple bound (2.3)

$$(\beta - \rho(y))(\rho(y) - \alpha) \leq \frac{\|r(y)\|^2}{\|y\|^2},$$

where $\alpha < \rho(y) < \beta$ and $\Sigma(A) \cap (\alpha, \beta) = \emptyset$, and its two dimensional analog (3.3)

$$[\lambda_{\max}(A_S) - \rho(y)][\rho(y) - \lambda_{\min}(A_S)] = \frac{\|P_S r(y)\|^2}{\|y\|^2}.$$

Our primary goal is to derive (2.3) from (3.3). We first do it for an important particular case, where we can even improve (2.3).

LEMMA 5.1. *Let $\alpha = \lambda_{\min}(A)$ be an isolated point of the spectrum of A and $\beta > \alpha$ be the nearest larger point of the spectrum of A . Let $\mathcal{X}$ denote the complete eigenspace corresponding to the eigenvalue α . For a given vector $y \neq 0$, such that $\alpha < \rho(y) < \beta$, we define $x = P_{\mathcal{X}}y$, where $P_{\mathcal{X}}$ is the orthogonal projector to the subspace $\mathcal{X}$. Assuming that $x \neq 0$, we denote $S = \text{span}\{x, y\}$. Then*

$$(5.1) \quad (\beta - \rho(y))(\rho(y) - \alpha) \leq \frac{\|P_S r(y)\|^2}{\|y\|^2},$$

where P_S is the orthogonal projector on the subspace S .

Proof. The assumption $\rho(y) > \alpha$ implies $y \notin \mathcal{X}$ since $\alpha = \lambda_{\min}(A)$, so $x \neq y$. The vector x is an eigenvector of A_S , and $\rho(x) = \lambda_{\min}(A) = \lambda_{\min}(A_S)$. Let $\mathcal{X}^\perp$ denote the orthogonal complement to the subspace $\mathcal{X}$. The vector $w = y - P_{\mathcal{X}}y \in S \cap \mathcal{X}^\perp$ is an eigenvector corresponding to the other eigenvalue of A_S , i.e., $\rho(w) = \lambda_{\max}(A_S)$. Since $\mathcal{X}$ is the complete eigenspace corresponding to the eigenvalue $\alpha = \lambda_{\min}(A)$, the fact that $w \in \mathcal{X}^\perp$ guarantees that $\beta \leq \rho(w)$. Therefore

$$\lambda_{\min}(A_S) = \alpha < \rho(y) < \beta \leq \rho(w) = \lambda_{\max}(A_S).$$

Substituting $\beta \leq \lambda_{\max}(A_S)$ for $\lambda_{\max}(A_S)$ in identity (3.3) gives the desired bound. $\square$

The Temple bound (2.3) follows from bound (5.1), using $\|P_S r(y)\| \leq \|r(y)\|$. In Remark 4.1 we have already discussed that having a bound based on $\|P_S r(y)\|$ rather than on $\|r(y)\|$ may give great advantages.

Of course, Lemma 5.1 can be easily reformulated for the case of the opposite side of the spectrum of the operator A . Returning our attention to our main goal, we can construct simple examples showing that bound (5.1) does not hold if neither α , nor β corresponds to the extreme points of the spectrum of the operator A . The extension of bound (5.1) to the general case is described below. We start with a technical lemma.

LEMMA 5.2. *Let $\rho(y) \notin \Sigma(A)$ for a given vector $y \neq 0$. Let us denote by U the invariant subspace of A associated to all of the spectrum of A larger than $\rho(y)$, and define $V = U + \text{span}\{y\}$. Then $\Sigma(A_V) = \rho(y) \cup \Sigma(A_U)$, and the smallest point of the spectrum $\Sigma_{\min}(A_V) < \rho(y)$ is an isolated point of the spectrum $\Sigma(A_V)$ —an eigenvalue of multiplicity one.*

Proof. Since $V = U + \text{span}\{y\}$, we have $\dim(V \cap U^\perp) = 1$. We define a nonzero vector $v = (I - P_U)y \in V \cap U^\perp$, and notice that $V = U \oplus \text{span}\{v\}$ is an orthogonal sum. Since U is an A -invariant subspace, it is also A_V -invariant. Then the decomposition $V = U \oplus \text{span}\{v\}$ implies that v is an eigenvector of operator A_V , corresponding the eigenvalue $\rho(y)$. Moreover, by the variational principle for the Rayleigh quotient, $\rho(y) \leq \rho(y) < \Sigma_{\min}(A_U)$, according to the definition of U . Thus, we deduce that $\Sigma(A_V) = \rho(y) \cup \Sigma(A_U)$, where $\rho(y) = \Sigma_{\min}(A_V)$ is an isolated point. The multiplicity of the eigenvalue $\rho(y)$ is one, because, again, $\dim(V \cap U^\perp) = 1$. $\square$

We are now prepared to prove our main result in this section.

THEOREM 5.3. *Let $\alpha < \rho(y) < \beta$ where α and β are the nearest points of the spectrum of A to $\rho(y)$. Let U be the invariant subspace of A associated to all of the*

spectrum of A larger than $\rho(y)$. We define $x = (I - P_U)y$ and $S = \text{span}\{x, y\}$. Then

$$(5.2) \quad (\beta - \rho(y))(\rho(y) - \alpha) \leq \frac{\|P_S r(y)\|^2}{\|y\|^2}.$$

Proof. Applying Lemma 5.2 and noticing that $\Sigma_{\min}(A_U) = \beta$, we observe that the assumptions of Lemma 5.1 are satisfied if A_V replaces A , where the scalar β and the eigenvalue $\Sigma_{\min}(A_V)$ are the nearest points of the spectrum of the operator A_V to $\rho(y, A_V) = \rho(y)$. Thus, by Lemma 5.1,

$$(\beta - \rho(y))(\rho(y) - \Sigma_{\min}(A_V)) \leq \frac{\|P_S r(y, A_V)\|^2}{\|y\|^2} = \frac{\|P_S r(y)\|^2}{\|y\|^2}.$$

Since $\Sigma_{\min}(A_V) \leq \alpha < \rho(y)$, we obtain (5.2). $\square$

REMARK 5.4. Substituting A with $-A$ in Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2, and using similar arguments, we end up with the same subspace $S = \text{span}\{P_U y, y\} = \text{span}\{(I - P_U)y, y\}$ and obtain exactly the same bound.

Repeating the arguments of section 2 with appropriate modifications, we obtain improved versions of the Kato-Temple inequality and other bounds, reviewed in section 2, from Theorem 5.3. Specifically, let the only point of the spectrum in the interval (a, b) be an eigenvalue λ , and let also $\rho(y) \in (a, b)$. Defining the subspace S as in Theorem 5.3, we get

$$-\frac{1}{\rho(y) - a} \frac{\|P_S r(y)\|^2}{\|y\|^2} \leq \rho(y) - \lambda \leq \frac{1}{b - \rho(y)} \frac{\|P_S r(y)\|^2}{\|y\|^2}.$$

Taking $a = \rho(y) - \delta$ and $b = \rho(y) + \delta$, where $\delta = \min_{\eta \in \{\Sigma(A)/\lambda\}} |\eta - \rho(y)|$, implies

$$|\lambda - \rho(y)| \leq \frac{1}{\delta} \frac{\|P_S r(y)\|^2}{\|y\|^2},$$

which, in its turn, gives us the improved Krylov-Weinstein bound,

$$|\lambda - \rho(y)| \leq \frac{\|P_S r(y)\|}{\|y\|}.$$

REMARK 5.5. We note that $\|P_S r(y)\| \leq \|P_V r(y)\| \leq \|r(y)\|$, since $S \subseteq V \subset \mathcal{H}$. Thus, first, the classical a posteriori bounds now trivially follows from our bounds. Second, if the smallest quantity $\|P_S r(y)\|$ may not be readily accessible in a practical situation, it can be bounded above by the following much simpler expression, $\|P_V r(y)\|$, which can still be dramatically smaller compared to the standard value $\|r(y)\|$ used in Temple bound (2.3). As an alternative for V , we can take $U^\perp + \text{span}\{y\} \supseteq S$.

6. Improving known error bounds for eigenvectors. The main topic of this work is RQ bounds. However, having the machinery of identities already constructed in section 3, we need only very little extra effort to revisit and improve some well known error bounds for eigenvectors, as a bonus. The reader might have noticed a couple of identities, (3.4) and (3.11), that have not yet been used. For convenience, we repeat them here, changing the notation in (3.4), for the case where $S = \text{span}\{x, y\}$, the vector x is an eigenvector of A (and, thus, A_S) with the eigenvalue $\lambda = \rho(x)$, the scalar $\eta \neq \lambda$ denotes the other eigenvalue of A_S , and $\theta = \angle\{x, y\}$:

$$(6.1) \quad \sin(2\theta) = \frac{2}{|\lambda - \eta|} \frac{\|P_S r(y)\|}{\|y\|}$$

and, if $\theta < \pi/2$,

$$(6.2) \quad \tan(\theta) = \frac{1}{|\eta - \rho(y)|} \frac{\|P_S r(y)\|}{\|y\|}.$$

In order to use identities (6.1) and (6.2), one needs to bound the scalar η . It is easily possible in the special case, where $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}(A)$ or $\lambda = \lambda_{\max}(A)$. The latter choice is reduced to the former one by substituting A with $-A$. We can use the arguments from the proof of Lemma 5.1 to handle the case $\lambda = \lambda_{\min}(A)$. Let the assumptions of Lemma 5.1 be satisfied, i.e., let $\alpha = \lambda_{\min}(A)$ be an isolated point of the spectrum of A and $\beta > \alpha$ be the nearest larger point of the spectrum of A . Let $\mathcal{X}$ denote the complete eigenspace corresponding to the eigenvalue α . For a given vector $y \neq 0$, such that $\alpha < \rho(y) < \beta$, we define $x = P_{\mathcal{X}} y$, where $P_{\mathcal{X}}$ is the orthogonal projector to the subspace $\mathcal{X}$; and we denote $S = \text{span}\{x, y\}$. Then $\lambda = \rho(x) = \alpha$ and $\beta \leq \eta$, directly by the proof of Lemma 5.1. Substituting $\beta \leq \eta$ in (6.1) and (6.2), we obtain the following improvements of the corresponding bounds from [1, 8]:

$$\sin(2\theta) \leq \frac{2}{\beta - \lambda} \frac{\|P_S r(y)\|}{\|y\|}$$

and, if $\theta < \pi/2$,

$$\tan(\theta) \leq \frac{1}{\beta - \rho(y)} \frac{\|P_S r(y)\|}{\|y\|}.$$

Conclusion. Not only have we found a new unifying proof technique, based on RQ identities. We have also made a significant improvement, adding an extra projector in front of the residual in the bounds that involve the norm of the residual.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. DAVIS AND W.M. KAHAN, *The rotation of eigenvectors by a perturbation*. III, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 7(1970), pp. 1–46.
- [2] T. KATO, *On the upper and lower bounds of eigenvalues*, J.Phys. Soc. Japan, 4(1976), pp. 334–339.
- [3] A.V. KNYAZEV, *Sharp a priori error estimates of the Rayleigh-Ritz method without assumptions of fixed sign or compactness*, Math. Notes, 38(1986), pp. 998–1002. doi:[10.1007/BF01157020](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01157020)
- [4] A.V. KNYAZEV, *New estimates for Ritz vectors*, Math. Comp., 66(1997), pp. 985–995. doi:[10.1090/S0025-5718-97-00855-7](https://doi.org/10.1090/S0025-5718-97-00855-7).
- [5] A.V. KNYAZEV, A. JUJUNASHVILI AND M.E. ARGENTATI, *Angles between infinite dimensional subspaces with applications to the Rayleigh-Ritz and alternating projectors methods*, J. Funct. Anal., 259(2010), pp. 1323–1345.
- [6] A.V. KNYAZEV AND M.E. ARGENTATI, *On proximity of Rayleigh quotients for different vectors and Ritz values generated by different trial subspaces*, Linear Algebra Appl., 415(2006), pp. 82–95. doi:[10.1016/j.laa.2005.06.032](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.laa.2005.06.032).
- [7] A.V. KNYAZEV AND M.E. ARGENTATI, *Rayleigh-Ritz majorization error bounds with applications to FEM*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. 31(2009), 3, pp. 1521–1537. doi:[10.1137/08072574X](https://doi.org/10.1137/08072574X)
- [8] B.N. PARLETT, *The symmetric eigenvalue problem*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1998.
- [9] A. RUHE, *Computation of eigenvalues and eigenvectors*, Lecture Notes in Math., 572(1977), pp. 130–184.
- [10] Y. SAAD, *Numerical methods for large eigenvalue problems*, Manchester University Press, 1992.
- [11] J. SUN, *Eigenvalues of Rayleigh quotient matrices*, Numer. Math., 59(1991), pp. 603–614. doi:[10.1007/BF01385798](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01385798)

- [12] G.W. STEWART AND J.G. SUN, *Matrix perturbation theory*, Computer Science and Scientific Computing, Academic Press Inc., Boston, MA, 1990, pp. xvi+365, ISBN = 0-12-670230-6.
- [13] G. TEMPLE, *The theory of Rayleigh's principle as applied to continuous systems*, Proc. Roy. Soc. London. Ser. A., 119(1928), pp. 276–293.
- [14] Y. ZHANG, LI QIU, *From subadditive inequalities of singular values to triangle inequalities of canonical angles*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. 31, 2009/10, 4, pp. 1606–1620. doi:[10.1137/09074841X](https://doi.org/10.1137/09074841X)